UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,622	03/22/2001	Mark E. Cannon	CANN-0208	3984

7590 05/02/2007

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts LLP
18 East University Drive, #101
Mesa, AZ 85201

EXAMINER	
FLEURANTIN, JEAN B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/814,622	CANNON, MARK E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEAN B. FLEURANTIN	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 April 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-22,96,97 and 101-120* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15-22,96,97 & 101-120* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to Applicant(s) arguments filed on 02/09/07.

The following is the current status of claims:

Claims 12, 14, 88-95 and 98-100 have been canceled.

Claims 101-117 and 121 have been withdrawn.

Claims 15-22, 96-97 and 101-120 remain pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 15-22, 96-97 and 118-120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As set forth in MPEP 2106:

As per independent claim 15

The independent claim 15 is directed to a program product, signal bearing, in which creates an advertising plan. The claimed steps are not being performed by any form of computer hardware component. Therefore, the mechanism for filtering data according to custom queries, analyzing the viewing behavior of selected demographic groups of people as the purpose of the invention. The claimed, "program product" and "signal bearing" fail to fall with one of four statutory categories of invention, process, machine, manufacture and composition, since it fails to produce a useful and tangible result.

Furthermore, the claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor a composition of matter. As such, the claim fails to fall within a statutory category. It is, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

As per independent claim 119

The independent claim 119 is directed to a program product, signal bearing, in which creates an advertising plan. The claimed steps are not being performed by any form of computer hardware component. Therefore, the mechanism for filtering data according to custom queries, analyzing the viewing behavior of selected demographic groups of people as the purpose of the invention. The claimed, "program product" and "signal bearing" fail to fall with one of four statutory categories of invention, process, machine, manufacture and composition, since it fails to produce a useful and tangible result.

Furthermore, the claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor a composition of matter. As such, the claim fails to fall within a statutory category. It is, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material per se, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See

Diehr, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in Benson were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

All dependent claims are rejected under the same rational.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-22, 96, 97 and 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,463,585 issued to Hendricks et al., ("Hendricks") in view of US Patent No. 5,155,591 issued to Wachob, ("Wachob"), and further in view of "Data mining techniques to gain insight into your data, pages 18-222" issued to Cipolla, Emil T. ("Cipolla").

As per claim 15, Hendricks discloses "a program product" (see col. 4, lines 29-32) comprising:

"an advertising plan optimization mechanism that creates an advertising plan" (i.e., use the available feeder channels for the programs that yield the largest maximum rank; see col. 39, lines 50-57)" wherein:

"the advertising plan optimization mechanism schedules a distribution of an advertising message on one or more broadcast or other shared media vehicles for exposure to potential customers, wherein the potential customers receive the same advertising massage (i.e., broadcasting programs; see col. 28, lines 34-45),

"an advertisement message to a selected group of potential message recipients" (i.e., select the advertisement for which a group with a higher value has already been selected (preselected group); see col. 37, line 58 to col. 38, line 60),

"the advertising plan optimization mechanism creates or modifies the advertising the message by modifying the distribution of the advertising message within an advertising schedule" (i.e., changing (modifying) program based on viewer preference; see col. 21, lines 8-11).

Hendricks fails to explicitly disclose signal bearing media bearing the advertising optimization mechanism. However, Wachob discloses signal bearing media bearing the advertising optimization mechanism (see Wachob col. 2, lines 24-36). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hendricks by signal bearing media bearing the advertising optimization mechanism as disclosed by Wachob (see col. 9, lines 36-39). Such a modification would allow the system of Hendricks to provide a method for targeting specific commercial advertisements to demographically selected audiences (see Wachob col. 1, lines 25-28)., therefore, improving the reliability of the method and apparatus for analyzing data and advertising optimization. While, Wachob and Hendricks fail to explicitly disclose evaluating resulting advertising plan to achieve one of an improved and an optimal advertising plan for the massage. However, Cipolla discloses evaluating resulting advertising plan to achieve one of an improved and an optimal advertising plan for the massage (see Cipolla page 21, lines 36-47). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hendricks by evaluating resulting advertising plan to achieve one of an improved and an optimal advertising plan for the massage as disclosed by Cipolla (see Cipolla page 18, lines 5-14 – Text - section). Such a modification would allow the system of Hendricks to provide better information for decision making (see Cipolla page 18, line 32-24).

As per claim 16, in addition to claim 15, Hendricks further discloses "transmission media" (see col. 9, lines 34-46).

As per claim 17, in addition to claim 15, Hendricks further discloses "recordable media" (see col. 28, lines 52-67).

As per claim 18, Hendricks further discloses "a plurality of indices which are utilized by the advertising plan optimization mechanism to iteratively modify the advertising plan" (see col. 20, lines 43-66).

As per claim 19, Hendricks discloses "the plurality of indices comprises at least one of an exposure valuation index" (see col. 21, lines 8-11), "an audience valuation index, an exposure recency index, a response index and a cost index" (see col. 20, lines 44-48).

As per claim 20, Hendricks further discloses "a data conversion mechanism comprising a mechanism for converting data from a first data format t a second data format" (i.e., converted from a waveform (first format) into a digital binary format (second format); see col. 19, lines 1-7).

As per claim 21, Hendricks further discloses "the first data format is a plurality of media exposure records" (see col. 19, lines 1-2) "the second data format is a plurality of variable length records which describe changes in media-related access data for a target audience" (see col. 25, lines 63-65).

As per claim 22, Hendricks further discloses "the first data format is a plurality of media exposure records" (see col. 19, lines 1-2) and "the second data format is a binary representation of the plurality of media exposure records" (see col. 19, lines 2-4).

As per claim 96, the limitations of claim 96 are similar to claims 15-19, therefore, the limitations of claim 96 are rejected in the analysis of claims 15-19, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

As per claim 97, Hendricks discloses "the media exposure records comprise television viewing records produced by A.C. Nielsen" (see col. 35, lines 16-65).

As per claim 118, the limitations of claim 118 are similar to claim 19, therefore, the limitations of claim 118 are rejected in the analysis of claim 19, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

As per claims 119-120, the limitations of claim 119-120 are similar to claims 15-22, therefore, the limitations of claims 119-120 are rejected in the analysis of claims 15-22, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Response to Applicant' Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed 8/21/06, with respect to claims 15-22, 96-97 and 101-120 have been fully considered but, have been found persuasive only to the extent that the prior art of record does not specifically discloses the limitations "evaluating resulting advertising plan to achieve one of an improved and an optimal advertising plan for the massage." However, Cipolla discloses such limitations.

Applicant's arguments with respect to 35 U.S.C. §101 rejections of claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant stated, page 13, pp 1, that "Claim 121 has been newly withdrawn by the Examiner. Applicant traverses this constructive election." It is noted that, the invention of claim 21 is distinct from the invention originally claimed as indicated. Thus, the arguments are moot.

Therefore, claim 121 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: a program product including an advertising plan optimization mechanism for use by a media planner, the program product comprising the advertising plan optimization mechanism connected to a user interface for use by the media planner in generating an advertising plan; the advertising plan optimization mechanism utilizes at least one database made up of non-real time data in creating the advertising plan, scheduling the distribution of the advertising massage, modifying the advertising plan, and evaluating the resulting advertising plan.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits.

Accordingly, claim 121 has been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Applicant stated, page 14, pp 3, that "the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based upon the Applicant's disclosure. A failure to meet any one of these criteria is a failure to establish a primafacie case of obviousness." It is noted that, Hendricks discloses a system and method for delivering targeted advertisements in a television network, and to efficiently convey targeted advertisements to a desired audience; see cols. 1 and 2, lines 30-31 and 25-26. Wachob discloses a method for targeting specific commercial advertisements to demographically selected audiences; see col. 1, lines 25-27). Thus, the combination of Hendricks and Wachob discloses the claimed limitations.

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

CONTACT INFORMATION

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEAN B. FLEURANTIN whose telephone number is 571-272-4035. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:05 to 4:35.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jean Bolte Fleurantin
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
April 26, 2007